

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
HAFSA KHAN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, KASHIF KHAN,
SALMON KHAN, DET. DOMENICO SARTORI,
JOHN DOE AND JANE DOE 1-5 inclusive, the
names of the last defendants being fictitious, the
true names being unknown to the plaintiff,

Defendants.
-----X

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

14-cv-4665 (SLT) (VMS)

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.
★ MAR 21 2016 ★
BROOKLYN OFFICE

TOWNES, United States District Judge:

On August 5, 2014, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a Complaint against Defendants The City of New York, Kashif Khan, Salmon Khan, Detective Domenico Sartori, and unidentified police officers John Doe and Jane Doe 1-5, alleging civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985. (ECF No. 1.) After dismissing her claims against certain Defendants, only Defendants Kashif Khan and Salmon Khan remain. (ECF No. 27.) Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint against the remaining two Defendants. (ECF No. 25.) Each of the two remaining Defendants filed motions to dismiss Plaintiff's claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). (ECF Nos. 34, 39.) On May 20, 2015 (ECF No. 38), this Court referred Defendants' motions to Magistrate Vera M. Scanlon ("Judge Scanlon") for a report and recommendation ("R&R").

On February 1, 2016, Judge Scanlon electronically filed and served her R&R in which she recommended: (a) granting Defendants' motions in their entirety; (b) that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims; (c) denying Plaintiff leave to replead; (d) denying Plaintiff's discovery demands; and (e) dismissing the Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 41.) The R&R also set forth that any objections to the R&R were to be filed within fourteen days of service. (*Id.* at 26.) To date, no objections have been filed and no party has requested an extension of time in which to do so.

A district court is not required to review the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of a report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Even when no objections are filed, however, many courts seek to satisfy themselves “that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee note (1983 Addition); *see also Edwards v. Town of Huntington*, No. 05 Civ. 339 (NGG) (AKT), 2007 WL 2027913, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. July 11, 2007).

Although not required to do so, this Court has reviewed Judge Scanlon’s R&R for clear error on the face of the record. The Court finds no clear error, and therefore adopts the R&R in its entirety as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Judge Scanlon’s Report and Recommendation, dated February 1, 2016, recommending that Defendants’ motions be granted in their entirety, that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s state law claims, that Plaintiff be denied leave to replead, that Plaintiff’s discovery demands be denied, and that the Amended Complaint be dismissed, is adopted in its entirety. The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to *pro se* Defendants Kashif Khan and Salmon Khan at the addresses listed for them on the docket. The Clerk of the Court is further directed to close this case.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Sandra L. Townes

SANDRA L. TOWNES
United States District Judge

Dated: March 17, 2016
Brooklyn, New York